

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being submitted *via* the USPTO EFS Filing System on the date shown below to **Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents**, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: August 6, 2008/Rebecca Stanford/
Rebecca Stanford**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re patent application of:

Applicant(s): Timothy S. Paek, *et al.*

Examiner: Kimberly M. Lovel

Serial No: 10/809,172

Art Unit: 2167

Filing Date: March 25, 2004

Title: WAVELENS SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR SEARCH RESULTS

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

Applicant submits this brief in connection with an appeal of the above-identified patent application. Payment is being submitted via credit card in connection with all fees due regarding this appeal brief. In the event any additional fees may be due and/or are not covered by the credit card, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP607US].

I. Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(i))

The real party in interest in the present appeal is Microsoft Corporation, the assignee of the present application.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(ii))

Appellants, appellants' legal representative, and/or the assignee of the present application are not aware of any appeals or interferences which may be related to, will directly affect, or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. Status of Claims (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(iii))

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1-27 stand rejected by the Examiner. The rejection of claims 1-27 is being appealed.

IV. Status of Amendments (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(iv))

Claims 11, 14, 24, and 26 were amended in response to the Final Office Action, and those amendments were entered by the Examiner for purposes of appeal in the Advisory Action dated May 21, 2008.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(v))**A. Independent claim 1**

Independent claim 1 recites: [a] computer-implemented interface for data presentation embodied on a computer-readable storage medium, comprising: a lens component associated with a portion of a user interface display, the lens component defines an area to display information from at least one search result (*See* Fig. 1; p. 5, lns. 23-29); and a layout component that displays a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, within the area defined by the lens component based upon the search result, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result, as compared to the amount of information displayed for the at least one search result when outside of the area defined by the lens

component (*See* Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1).

B. Independent claim 20

Independent claim 20 recites: [a] computer-implemented system for displaying query results, comprising: a processor (*See* Fig. 11; p. 15, lns. 1-3); means for retrieving search results from a database, each search result of the search results comprising textual information associated with the respective search result (*See* Fig. 1; p. 5, lns. 12-17); means for processing the search results in accordance with a lens (*See* Fig. 1, p. 5, lns. 23-29; Fig. 11; p. 15, lns. 1-3); means for displaying at least one search result from within the lens and other search results outside the lens (*See* Fig. 1; p. 5, lns. 23-29); means for inserting additional textual information associated with the at least one search result within the lens as compared to other search results outside the lens, the additional textual information is selected from the at least one search result for insertion within the lens based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result (*See* Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1); and means for animating the at least one search result displayed within the lens to magnify it in size as compared to other search results outside the lens (*See* Figs. 1, 2, 5; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 7, lns. 3-10; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1).

C. Independent claim 21

Independent claim 21 recites: [a] method for automatic search result organization, comprising: defining a plurality of parameters for displaying search results, each search result comprised of content associated with the respective search result, the content comprising subsets of the content where each subset is associated with a content type (*See* Fig. 10; p. 14, lns. 13-18); defining a lens region to display at least one of the search results; displaying at least one of the search results within the lens region and at least one other search result outside the lens region (*See* Fig. 10; p. 14, lns. 19-23); inserting additional content associated with the at least one of the search results within the lens region, the additional content is selected from the at least one of the search results for insertion within the lens region based in part on a query associated with the at least one of the search results (*See* Fig. 1, 4, and 5, and 10; p. 14, lns. 21-25; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1); and animating the content associated

with the at least one of the search results displayed within the lens region to enlarge the size of the content as compared to content associated with the at least one other search result displayed outside the lens region (*See* Figs. 1, 5, and 10; p. 14, lns. 21-25; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1).

D. Independent claim 25

Independent claim 25 recites: [a] computer-implemented graphical user interface embodied on a computer-readable storage medium, comprising: one or more data items and results respectively associated therewith retrieved from a database, each of the one or more data items comprising text associated with a respective result (*See* Fig. 1; p. 5, lns. 12-17); one or more display objects created for the one or more data items (*See* Fig. 1; p. 5, lns. 13-19); an input component for selecting the one or more data items and parameters respectively associated with each of the one or more data items (*See* Fig. 1; p. 5, lns. 19-21); and a lens component to present at least one of the one or more display objects in a different format with respect to a collection of the one or more data items, the different format comprises animation of the at least one of the one or more display objects to magnify that display object in size and modify that display object to include additional text that is retrieved from a result to be included in the display object based in part on a query associated with the result, as compared to display objects outside of the lens component (*See* Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1).

E. Dependent claim 18

Dependent claim 18 recites: the dynamic information view is coordinated with an amount of information to progressively insert additional information associated with the at least one search result into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result (*See* Figs. 4 and 5; p. 9, lns. 24-26; p. 3, lns. 3-5).

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(vi))

- A. Whether claims 1-12, 15-17, and 19-27 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over “Visual Bracketing for Web Search Result Visualization” to Roberts *et al.* in

view of the article “Context Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces” to Pook *et al.*

- B. Whether claim 13 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Wolton *et al.* (US Pub. No. 2004/0030741).
- C. Whether claim 14 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Montague (US Pub. No. 2005/0168488).
- D. Whether claim 18 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Szabo (US Pub. No. 2007/0156677).

VII. Argument (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(vii))

A. Rejection of Claims 1-12, 15-17, and 19-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-12, 15-17, and 19-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article “Visual Bracketing for Web Search Result Visualization” to Roberts *et al.* (hereinafter “Roberts *et al.*”) in view of the article “Context Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces” to Pook *et al.* (hereinafter “Pook *et al.*”). It is requested that this rejection be reversed for at least the following reason. Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the subject claims. To reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a),

the prior art reference (or references when combined) ***must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.*** See MPEP § 706.02(j) (emphasis added). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant’s disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The claimed subject matter relates to automatic and dynamic presentation of search result information in accordance with an adjustable viewing lens that can balance the desire to examine a plurality of search results while promoting, expanding, or highlighting information of interest within the lens. (See Figs. 1 and 5; p. 2, lns. 23-26.) The claimed subject matter selectively animates, magnifies, and/or presents information associated with a search result(s) within a lens area as compared to the display of information outside the lens area. (See Figs. 1 and 5; p. 5, ln. 13 – p. 6, ln. 2.) Further, additional information (e.g., query-relevant textual information associated with a search result) can be progressively inserted while the search result is within the lens area so that more information associated with the search result is displayed, as compared to the amount of information displayed when the search result is outside the lens area. (See Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 6, lns. 5-14; p. 9, lns. 24-26.)

Employing animation of text and/or content insertion associated with a search result displayed within the lens area, the claimed subject matter can allow a user to more easily review more detailed information associated with the search result when displayed within the lens area, while providing a de-emphasized view of other information outside of the lens area. (See p. 4, lns. 23-26; p. 5, ln. 29 – p. 6, ln. 2.) The de-emphasis of search results outside the lens area can allow more search results to be displayed in the interface in order to minimize the need for scrolling and other actions when multiple search results are obtained from a query, for example. . (See p. 4, lns. 23-26.)

In particular, independent claim 1, as amended, recites: a layout component that ***displays a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, within the area defined by the lens component based upon the search result, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result***, as compared to the amount of information displayed for the at least one search result when outside of the area defined by the lens component. Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive aspect of the claimed subject matter.

Rather, Roberts *et al.* relates to a visual bracketing method that provides detail-in-context views where the inner part contains the Focus bracketed by the context information at a lower semantic level. (See Abstract.) Roberts *et al.* teaches a visual bracketing effect by displaying

different semantic information in fore and after visualizations. (See § 2.2.) Roberts *et al.* further teaches an inner part that contains the detail view while the bracketed visualizations contain the context information at a lower level of detail. (See *id.*) However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Roberts *et al.* fails to teach displaying a detailed subset of information, including textual information, in the lens component based upon the search result, where the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include *additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query* associated with the at least one search result.

Further, Pook *et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of Roberts *et al.* with regard to the claimed subject matter. Pook *et al.* relates to zoomable user interfaces. (See p. 143, § 5.) Pook *et al.* teaches that users change the scale of their view of the information space depending on the level of detail that they want to see at a given moment. (See p. 115, § 4.4.) Pook *et al.* also teaches semantic zooming where, as a user zooms on an object, the object grows until it vanishes and is replaced by other objects that represent the same underlying information but in more detail. (See *id.*) However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Pook *et al.* fails to teach animating a subset of information to enlarge in size and to include *additional textual information that is selected from a search result for insertion into the subset of information based in part on a query* associated with the at least one search result. Instead, Pook *et al.* teaches that static portals can be used in semantic zooming. (See pp. 115-116, § 4.4.1.)

In contrast, the claimed subject matter can include a defined area (e.g., lens area) in an interface wherein a detailed subset of information, such as information related to a search result(s), can be displayed. (See Fig. 1; p. 5, ln. 13 – p. 6, ln. 2.) In one aspect, when a search result is placed and/or displayed within the lens area, ***additional textual information*** or other information associated with that search result can be ***inserted into the detailed subset of information*** displayed within the lens area, as compared to the amount of information that is displayed when the search result is outside the lens area. (See Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1.) The ***additional textual information*** can be ***selected from the search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on the query*** associated with the search result (e.g., query-relevant text insertion). (See *id.*) In another aspect, a subset of information displayed within the lens area can be animated to enlarge in size (e.g., magnify in size) as compared to information displayed

outside of the lens area in the interface. (See Figs. 1 and 5; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1.)

As an example of content insertion, a search result (and other search results) can be returned and a subset of information related to the search result, such as a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and/or a summary of the page associated with the search result and/or other information related to the search result, can be displayed in an interface, where the subset of information can be displayed outside the lens area. (See, e.g., Figs. 1 and 3; p. 5, lns. 13-22.) In accordance with an aspect, based in part on the query that produced the search result(s), the claimed subject matter can facilitate capturing additional information, such as query-relevant textual information, from the search result, and the additional information can be available to be utilized for insertion into the detailed subset of information when the search result is within the lens area, as desired. (See Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1.) When the lens area is placed over the search area, or when the search result is otherwise within the lens area, the additional information (e.g., query-relevant textual information) can be retrieved and inserted into the detailed subset of information displayed within the lens area to facilitate providing more detailed information regarding the search result. (See *id.*)

Independent claim 21 (and similarly independent claim 20) recites: ***inserting additional content associated with the at least one of the search results within the lens region, the additional content is selected from the at least one of the search results for insertion within the lens region based in part on a query associated with the at least one of the search results.*** Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive aspect of the claimed subject matter.

For at least reasons similar to the reasons stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the distinctive aspects of the claimed subject matter. For instance, Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* fail to teach selecting additional content associated with a search result for insertion within a lens region of an interface based in part on the query associated with the search result, when the search result is displayed within the lens region.

In contrast, the claimed subject matter can facilitate capturing and inserting additional content associated with a search result while the search result is within a lens region. The

additional content, for insertion, can be *selected* from the search result *based in part on the query* that produced the search result (e.g., query-relevant text insertion). (See Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1.)

Independent claim 25 recites: a lens component to present at least one of the one or more display objects in a different format with respect to a collection of the one or more data items, the different format comprises *animation of the at least one of the one or more display objects to magnify that display object in size and modify that display object to include additional text that is retrieved from a result to be included in the display object based in part on a query associated with the result*, as compared to display objects outside of the lens component. For at least reasons similar to the reasons stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest this distinctive feature of the claimed subject matter.

The claimed subject matter can employ query-relevant text insertion to capture additional information from a search result *based in part on the query*. (See p. 6, lns. 5-8.) The claimed subject matter can modify a display object to include the additional information in the display object when the display object is within the display area of the lens component. (See Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1.)

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in independent claim 1, 20, 21, and 25 (and associated dependent claims 2-6, 10, 12, 15-19, 22-24, 26, and 27). Accordingly, the subject claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be reversed.

B. Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Wolton *et al.* (US Pub. No. 2004/0030741) (hereinafter “Wolton *et al.*”). It is requested that this rejection be reversed for at least the following reason. Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Wolton *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter. Claim 13 depends from independent claim 1. Wolton *et al.* fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Wolton *et al.* relates

to a tool for creating intelligent information management applications in the form of specialized search and retrieval agents. (*See* p. 3, ¶ [0048].) Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be reversed.

C. Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Montague (US Pub. No. 2005/0168488) (hereinafter “Montague”). It is requested that this rejection be reversed for at least the following reason. Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Montague, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter. Claim 14 depends from independent claim 1. Montague fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Montague relates to methods of combining user interfaces, such as zooming in/out, panning, rotating, drawing, selecting, and manipulating during a drag by a mouse for a graphics display. (*See* p. 1, ¶ [0004].) In view of at least the foregoing alone, the rejection should be reversed.

D. Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Szabo (US Pub. No. 2007/0156677) (hereinafter “Szabo”). It is requested that this rejection be reversed for at least the following reason. Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Szabo, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter.

Claim 18 depends from independent claim 1. Szabo fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. For at least the foregoing reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, Claim 18 additionally recites: ***the dynamic information view is coordinated with an amount of information to progressively insert additional information associated with the at least one search result into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result.*** Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Szabo, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive functionality of the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner states that Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* fail to teach the claimed subject matter as recited in claim 18. (See Office Action dated February 15, 2008, p. 14, ¶ 9.) Further, Szabo fails to teach the distinctive functionality as recited in claim 18. Rather, Szabo relates to a user interface wherein the user may “hover”, or hold a graphic cursor near a screen object, to trigger a change in display rather than requiring a mouse click. (See p. 41, ¶ [0349].) However, Szabo fails to teach progressively inserting additional information associated with a search result into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the search result. Instead, Szabo teaches that while hovering, the user can increase the detail to see siblings, parents, and dependents related to taxonomic categories. (See p. 41, ¶¶ [0345]-[0350].) Szabo does not teach progressively inserting additional information related to a search result nor does Szabo teach progressive insertion of additional information based on the amount of time the mouse hovers over a search result.

Conversely, the claimed subject matter can progressively insert information related to a search result in a detailed subset of information, when the search result is displayed in an area within the lens component, based in part on the amount of time a mouse hovers over the search result. (See Figs. 4 and 5; p. 9, lns. 24-26; p. 3, lns. 3-5.) For example, the longer the mouse hovers over the search result in the lens component area, the more information related to the search result is inserted into the detailed subset of information related to the search result.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Szabo, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, the rejection should be reversed.

VIII. Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1-27 be reversed.

If any additional fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP607US].

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24th Floor, National City Center
1900 East 9th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone: (216) 696-8730
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731

IX. Claims Appendix (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(viii))

1. A computer-implemented interface for data presentation embodied on a computer-readable storage medium, comprising:
 - a lens component associated with a portion of a user interface display, the lens component defines an area to display information from at least one search result; and
 - a layout component that displays a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, within the area defined by the lens component based upon the search result, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result, as compared to the amount of information displayed for the at least one search result when outside of the area defined by the lens component.
2. The interface of claim 1, further comprising at least one search engine and at least one local or remote database to retrieve the search result.
3. The interface of claim 1, the layout component receives user inputs that operates, alters, or selects display criteria of the lens component and other search results.
4. The interface of claim 3, further comprising one or more parameters that effect the display criteria.
5. The interface of claim 4, the parameters include at least one of a lens size, a lens shape, a lens location, a magnification factor, a presentation rate, a delay, a trigger, or a minimum font size.
6. The interface of claim 1, further comprising at least one other lens component to display information.

7. The interface of claim 1, the lens component is defined as a fisheye lens that is applied vertically to a display at about a focal center of the display.
8. The interface of claim 7, the focal center includes one result item comprising a title, description, and URL of a web page.
9. The interface of claim 7, the fisheye lens is associated with a piecewise view.
10. The interface of claim 1, further comprising a display option for controlling a rate of magnification for the lens component by using a factor as a target and incrementally adjusting a zoom until the target is reached.
11. The interface of claim 10, the detailed subset of information displayed within the area defined by the lens component increases in size until a maximum size is reached.
12. The interface of claim 10, further comprising a parameter that controls a size of zoom increments.
13. The interface of claim 12, the zoom increments are controlled with a step function.
14. The interface of claim 12, further comprising geometric or exponential functions that allow the detailed subset of information to grow or settle at varying acceleration.
15. The interface of claim 12, further comprising a content insertion parameter that is adjusted according to a rate of insertion or according to a size of information chunks.
16. The interface of claim 1, further comprising a control panel to allow designers to adjust display parameters for the lens component or the layout component.
17. The interface of claim 1, further comprising a display output associated with at least one of an instant information view or a dynamic information view.

18. The interface of claim 17, the dynamic information view is coordinated with an amount of information to progressively insert additional information associated with the at least one search result into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result.

19. A computer readable medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon for implementing the components of claim 1.

20. A computer-implemented system for displaying query results, comprising:
a processor;
means for retrieving search results from a database, each search result of the search results comprising textual information associated with the respective search result;
means for processing the search results in accordance with a lens;
means for displaying at least one search result from within the lens and other search results outside the lens;
means for inserting additional textual information associated with the at least one search result within the lens as compared to other search results outside the lens, the additional textual information is selected from the at least one search result for insertion within the lens based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result; and
means for animating the at least one search result displayed within the lens to magnify it in size as compared to other search results outside the lens.

21. A method for automatic search result organization, comprising:
- defining a plurality of parameters for displaying search results, each search result comprised of content associated with the respective search result, the content comprising subsets of the content where each subset is associated with a content type;
 - defining a lens region to display at least one of the search results;
 - displaying at least one of the search results within the lens region and at least one other search result outside the lens region;
 - inserting additional content associated with the at least one of the search results within the lens region, the additional content is selected from the at least one of the search results for insertion within the lens region based in part on a query associated with the at least one of the search results; and
 - animating the content associated with the at least one of the search results displayed within the lens region to enlarge the size of the content as compared to content associated with the at least one other search result displayed outside the lens region.
22. The method of claim 21, the parameters include at least one of a lens size, a lens shape, a lens location, a magnification factor, a viewing rate, a delay, a trigger, or a minimum font size.
23. The method of claim 22, further comprising providing a focal center for the lens region.
24. The method of claim 23, further comprising controlling a rate of magnification associated with the lens region by using a factor as a target and incrementally adjusting a zoom until the target is reached.

25. A computer-implemented graphical user interface embodied on a computer-readable storage medium, comprising:

one or more data items and results respectively associated therewith retrieved from a database, each of the one or more data items comprising text associated with a respective result;

one or more display objects created for the one or more data items;

an input component for selecting the one or more data items and parameters respectively associated with each of the one or more data items; and

a lens component to present at least one of the one or more display objects in a different format with respect to a collection of the one or more data items, the different format comprises animation of the at least one of the one or more display objects to magnify that display object in size and modify that display object to include additional text that is retrieved from a result to be included in the display object based in part on a query associated with the result, as compared to display objects outside of the lens component.

26. The interface of claim 25, further comprising controls for interacting with a search engine, a database, the one or more display objects, or the lens component.

27. The interface of claim 25, the one or more display objects are associated with at least one of text insertion, query-relevant text insertion, thumbnails of a web page, information about a size of a result, a download speed, or a recency of a page.

X. Evidence Appendix (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(ix))

None.

XI. Related Proceedings Appendix (37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(x))

None.